

# **Fight against scientific plagiarism**

## **RULES**

### **I. GENERAL PROVISIONS**

1.1. These rules of the Republic of Azerbaijan about copyright and related rights", "About Education" and "About Science" laws, "Regulation on the procedure for awarding scientific degrees" approved by decree No. 728 of the president of the republic of Azerbaijan dated June 11, 2019, and of the "Regulation on the procedure for assigning scientific names", it was prepared on the basis of relevant provisions of the international agreements and other relevant normative-legal acts to which the Republic of Azerbaijan has joined in this field.

1.2. The main purpose of the rules is to determine the procedures for ensuring the authenticity of scientific works and educational materials at UNEC and preventing cases of scientific plagiarism in their preparation.

1.3. The rules determine the degree of originality of scientific works and educational materials and the procedures for detecting and eliminating cases of scientific plagiarism and the degree of responsibility for cases of scientific plagiarism.

1.4. Basic concepts used in the rules:

1.4.1. Work - student works (course work, abstracts, freelance work, laboratory work, projects and other tasks of this type, final work, master's thesis), doctor of philosophy and sciences dissertation, monograph, article, teaching materials (curriculum, textbook, methodological instruction, etc.) and others;

1.4.2. A case of scientific plagiarism - at work from the works of other authors without reference to the author and source use case.

1.4.3. Software plagiarism check (hereinafter – plagiarism check) – the process of detecting similar parts related to the works of other authors placed on internet resources before the moment of checking, in the electronic version of the work using the appropriate software adopted at UNEC.

1.4.4. Operator – person responsible for plagiarism check in structural unit of UNEC.

1.4.5. Anti-plagiarism system – a digital resource used to check plagiarism through software adopted at UNEC.

1.4.6. Plagiarism report – a report generated automatically during a plagiarism check in the anti-plagiarism system and reflecting the results of the check.

1.4.7. The first similarity coefficient is the share (in %) of the total amount of similar parts (with the number of signs) found in the work and the volume of which consists of 5 consecutive words (with the number of signs) in the total volume of the work (with the number of signs). The purpose of applying this coefficient is to determine and limit the level of use of the names of laws, literature, organizations, concepts, rules, instructions and other documents, works of other authors, as well as standard expressions in the relevant field of science.

1.4.8. Second similarity coefficient - the share (in %) of the total amount of similar parts (in number of signs) found in the work and the volume of which is 20 consecutive words in the total volume (in number of signs) of the work. This coefficient is used in the work to determine and limit the volume of large similar parts. Cases of partial change (adding or removing a few words, other methods) of parts belonging to other authors and consisting of 20 consecutive words in the text of the work are detected by the software, and these parts are accepted for calculation of the 2nd coefficient. Similar parts of 20 consecutive words are used in the calculation of this coefficient, regardless of the indication of the reference.

1.4.9. Third similarity coefficient - the share (in %) of the volume of all parts (references, concepts, terms, names and other expressions) written in quotation marks ("...") in the work in the total volume of the work. This coefficient is used to limit the use of quotation marks, concepts and other expressions in the work. If the volume of the text written in quotation marks and detected as a similar part consists of a part of 5 consecutive words, its volume is the 1st coefficient, and similar texts consisting of a part of 20 consecutive words are the 2nd is also used in the calculation of the coefficient.

1.4.10. Manipulation – an attempt to hide plagiarism in the text of the work submitted for plagiarism checking by using invisible (white) marks, letter changes, micro-spaces, extra intervals, paraphrasing and other methods.

1.4.11. Letter change is the writing of letters in different fonts or different alphabets. At this time, Roman numerals, special signs used in mathematical expressions, graphs, schemes and tables, expressions that require writing in fonts different from the main font of the text (in Latin or other languages) are not considered a case of manipulation.

1.4.12. Paraphrasing – an attempt to hide plagiarism by partially changing (adding or removing a few words, other methods) materials belonging to other authors in the text of the work.

1.5. The types of works prepared at UNEC and subject to plagiarism check are approved by order of UNEC rector. Works prepared in external organizations, but defended or published at UNEC, must also be checked for plagiarism.

1.6. The plagiarism report, which reflects the results of the plagiarism check conducted by the software adopted at UNEC, is the main document for determining the existence of scientific plagiarism cases in the work.

1.7. The first plagiarism check assigned for works submitted by persons studying at UNEC and employees of UNEC, as well as works prepared in external organizations, but defended or published at UNEC, is carried out at the expense of UNEC. If rechecks are necessary, the cost of plagiarism checking shall be borne by the authors.

1.8. It is recommended that all plagiarism check correspondence be done through the corporate emails of students, UNEC employees, operators and other UNEC officials.

1.9. The dynamism of internet resources, the technical availability of resources at the time the work is submitted for plagiarism checking, and other technical reasons do not guarantee that the same results will be obtained when the same work is rechecked. Therefore, the authors are responsible for any similar passages found in each plagiarism check that belong to other authors.

1.10. The composition of the criteria defined by these rules for determining scientific plagiarism and the thresholds for those criteria can be changed only by the decision of the Scientific Council of the university.

1.11. The following individuals are responsible for ensuring that the plagiarism-checked content of the work matches the published or defended content:

1.11.1. On educational materials and monographs - authors, the head of the relevant department, faculty or center, as well as the teaching-methodical council;

1.11.2. On student affairs - author, evaluator, scientific director, head of the relevant department, chairman and secretary of the councils created for the defense of graduate studies and master's theses;

1.11.3. For doctoral theses of philosophy and sciences, as well as articles - author, scientific supervisor or scientific advisor, heads of structural units (department, division, laboratory, center, etc.) participating in the organization of the initial discussion, chairman of the Dissertation Council, scientific secretary and official opponents, management of the editorial board of the magazine.

## **II. Plagiarism check procedures**

2.1. Plagiarism checking of student works can be done in two ways - with the participation of the operator or by the student himself.

2.1.1. Plagiarism checks conducted with the participation of the operator are organized as follows:

2.1.1.1. The student prepares the electronic version of the work in a word file in full compliance with the requirements of the relevant rules adopted by UNEC, without allowing cases of manipulation.

2.1.1.2. The student sends the electronic version of the thesis in a Word file from his corporate email address available in the UNEC domain to the corporate email address of the evaluator (subject teacher, supervisor of the graduation thesis, scientific supervisor of the master's thesis, etc.) within the time specified by the relevant rules.

2.1.1.3. The evaluator checks the level of compliance of the work with the requirements of the relevant rules applied at UNEC, if he finds any defects, he sends written information about it to the student and sets a time for eliminating the defects. The detection of inconsistency with the requirements of the rules in the design of the case is the basis for not allowing the case to the next stage of the evaluation process. The evaluator sends the work prepared according to the rules to the operator and is responsible for any discrepancies in the content of this work.

2.1.1.4. The operator uploads the work submitted by the evaluator to the anti-plagiarism system for plagiarism checking.

2.1.1.5. The operator sends the plagiarism report (pdf form of the short and full inspection report) to the author, the evaluator, the head of the secretariat of the faculty, school or center where the student is studying.

2.1.2. If the plagiarism checking platform allows the student to check the work himself, the operator's participation in the checking process is cancelled. The student sends the work to an evaluator for review, and after receiving an approval response from that person, uploads the work to the anti-plagiarism system for checking. The student and the evaluator are responsible for violations of the rules applied in UNEC in the content and design of the examined work.

2.1.3. Decisions regarding student works, which the result of the plagiarism check is considered unsatisfactory according to the criteria specified in clauses 3.2.4, 3.2.5 and 3.3 of these rules, are made according to clause 3.6 of these rules.

2.2. The plagiarism check of doctor of philosophy and science dissertations is carried out in the following manner:

2.2.1. Plagiarism check of philosophy and doctor of science dissertations can be carried out in two ways - with the participation of the operator or by the doctoral student himself.

2.2.1.1 Plagiarism checks conducted with the participation of the operator are organized as follows:

2.2.1.2. Within 5 working days after the date of the doctoral student's application to the rector of UNEC about the organization of the preliminary discussion of the dissertation, the electronic version of the dissertation is sent to the operator of the doctoral department, and the bound copy of the dissertation, signed by him and his scientific supervisor, is personally submitted to the doctoral department of UNEC does.

2.2.1.3. After checking the identity of the hard copy of the dissertation with the electronic version submitted by the doctoral student who has fully completed the individual work plan, the operator uploads it to the system for plagiarism checking within 2 working days and sends the

received plagiarism reference with a letter to the author, the scientific supervisor and the head of the doctoral department.

2.2.2. If the platform where the plagiarism check is carried out allows the doctoral student to check the work himself, the operator's participation in the check process is canceled. The doctoral student sends the work to the scientific supervisor for consideration, and after receiving an approval response, uploads the work to the anti-plagiarism system for checking. The doctoral student and the scientific supervisor are responsible for violations of the relevant rules in the content and design of the examined work. The person in charge of the anti-plagiarism system sends the plagiarism report to the secretariat of the relevant faculty, school or center.

2.2.3. Decisions about the dissertation, which result of the plagiarism check is not considered satisfactory according to the criteria specified in clauses 3.2.5 and 3.3 of these rules, are made according to clause 3.8 of these rules.

***2.3. Plagiarism check of monographs and educational materials is carried out in the following manner:***

2.3.1. The monograph or teaching material is discussed in the department, faculty or center's scientific council, if the publication of the work is considered appropriate, it is sent to IMDC for plagiarism check with the presentation of the head of the faculty or center (extracts from the minutes of the meetings of the department's, faculty or center's scientific council are submitted and an electronic version of the work is added in a word file).

2.3.2. The operator of the doctoral department uploads the work to the system within 3 working days after receiving the electronic version of the work, sends the received plagiarism reference to the authors, the head of the department, faculty or center, and the secretary of the Teaching and Methodological Council of UNEC.

2.3.3. The decision on the work, which is not considered satisfactory according to the criteria specified in clauses 3.2 and 3.3 of these Rules as a result of the plagiarism check, is made according to clauses 3.7 and 3.9 of these Rules.

***2.4. The plagiarism check of articles submitted to scientific journals published in UNEC is carried out in the following manner:***

2.4.1. The editor-in-chief of the magazine sends the electronic version of the article in a word file to the IMDC with an appropriate presentation.

2.4.2. Within 5 working days after the article is entered into the IMDC, the journal operator uploads the work to the system, sends the pdf form of the complete plagiarism check report with a letter to the author and the editor-in-chief of the journal.

2.3.3. A decision on an article whose result of the plagiarism check is considered unsatisfactory according to the criteria specified in clauses 3.2.5 and 3.3 of these rules is made according to clause 3.9 of these rules.

### **III. Making decisions based on the results of the plagiarism check**

3.1. The following criteria are used to determine the originality of the work and the presence of cases of scientific plagiarism in the work:

3.1.1. Failure to properly cite similar parts found;

3.1.2. I, II and III similarity coefficients;

3.1.3. the number of detected manipulation cases.

3.1.4. the presence of similar parts in the introduction, conclusion and proposals part of scientific works, as well as in the parts where the scientific innovation of the work is expressed.

3.2. The permissible limits of I and II similarity coefficients for work are considered as follows:

3.2.1. The I similarity coefficient for subject programs should not exceed 40%, and the II similarity coefficient should not exceed 10%;

3.2.2. The I similarity coefficient for textbooks should not exceed 40%, and the II similarity coefficient should not exceed 15%;

3.2.3. The I similarity coefficient for teaching materials should not exceed 40%, and the II similarity coefficient should not exceed 10% (more than 4% according to methodological instructions);

3.2.4. The coefficient of similarity I for free works, abstracts, course works, projects and other educational tasks, final works should not exceed 40%, and the coefficient of similarity II should not exceed 7%;

3.2.5. For master's, philosophy and doctoral theses, monographs, scientific articles, research works, the I similarity coefficient should not exceed 40%, and the II similarity coefficient should not exceed 4%;

3.2.6. In the case, the III similarity coefficient should not exceed 25%.

3.3. The total number of cases of manipulation in the work (except for paraphrases) should not exceed 100.

3.3.1. Re-examination of work manipulation due to exceeding the norm can be carried out 2 (two) times during one semester (except for the cases mentioned in clauses 3.6.4, 3.7.3, 3.8.3 and 3.9.3 of these Rules). If the number of manipulation cases in the second check due to the cases of manipulation during the semester is more than the norm, then the third plagiarism check of that work is carried out in the next semester.

3.3.2. The work should be submitted to the repeated plagiarism check, with the manipulation cases removed and without changes in the content, which is determined due to the higher than normal number of cases of manipulation.

3.3.3. During the plagiarism check, the number of cases of manipulation in the work is more than the norm specified in clause 3.3 of these Rules, and satisfactory according to other criteria, as well as those mentioned in clauses 3.6.1, 3.6.3, 3.7.1, 3.8.1 and 3.9.1 of these Rules when the results are received, the author (or authors) are given at least 2 days to remove the manipulations, and the work with the same content, with the manipulations removed, is submitted by the author for a second plagiarism check (at the author's expense). The result of the plagiarism check is considered unsatisfactory if differences (regardless of the volume) are found in the content of the rechecked work due to cases of manipulation with the content before the check. If the results of the re-examination show that the cases of manipulation in the case are within the norm, the decision on that case is based on 3.6 of these Rules,

3.3.4. If the results specified in clauses 3.6.4, 3.7.3, 3.8.3 and 3.9.3 of these Rules are obtained during the plagiarism check, re-checking is not scheduled due to cases of manipulation.

3.3.5. If the number of cases of manipulation in the work exceeds 1000 (except for the cases specified in clause 3.3.4), then the person responsible for the plagiarism system can eliminate the cases of manipulation in the work and send the work to the plagiarism check again. At this time, no changes should be made in the content of the work, the content of the re-checked work should be the same as the content of the work submitted to the previous check. If during the re-examination of this case, manipulation cases are found to be within the norm, then the decision on that case is made on the basis of other results of the re-examination conducted by the responsible person and in accordance with the relevant clauses of these Rules.

3.4. If during the plagiarism check a satisfactory result is obtained for all the criteria specified in clauses 3.2 and 3.3 of these Rules, but no references are indicated in the detected similar parts, the author should add references in the relevant places of the work based on the plagiarism reference and make appropriate corrections in the list of sources. Along with the authors, the evaluator, scientific director or consultant, heads of relevant departments, faculties or centers, heads of relevant Dissertation Councils, scientific secretaries, official opponents, and the head of the editorial board of the journal are responsible for the complete and accurate execution of the mentioned corrections.

3.5. According to the results of the plagiarism check, works considered satisfactory according to the criteria specified in clauses 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 of these Rules are sent to the next stage (final assessment, preliminary discussion, defense process, consideration by the Teaching Methodological Council, decision on publication, etc.).

**3.6. According to the results of the plagiarism check on graduation theses and master's theses, freelance works, abstracts, coursework, projects and other educational assignments, the following decisions are made:**

3.6.1. At least 5 days for coursework, abstracts, freelance work, laboratory work, projects and other tasks of this type, for graduation theses and master's theses, in order to make the necessary corrections to the author and provide full references to the used sources, if one of the following results is received during the first plagiarism check of the work. and 10 days (this period can be reduced to 5 days if the 2nd similarity coefficient is less than 10%).

3.6.1.1. If the value of the similarity coefficient I exceeds the limit specified in clauses 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 of these Rules and is up to 50%;

3.6.1.2. If the value of the similarity coefficient II exceeds the limit specified in clauses 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 of these Rules and is up to 30%;

3.6.1.3. When the value of the III similarity coefficient is more than 25% and up to 40%;

3.6.1.4. If there are similar parts without references in the introduction, results and proposals part of the work, as well as in the parts where the scientific novelty of the work is expressed (except for law, organization, concept, rule, instruction names and standard expressions in the relevant scientific field)

3.6.2. If the results of the first plagiarism check of the work are within the criteria mentioned in clause 3.6.1 of these rules, the work can be submitted to the second plagiarism check in the form specified in clause 2.1 of these rules after the end of the period specified in that clause. If during the second plagiarism check of the work, a satisfactory result is not obtained according to one of the criteria defined in clauses 3.2 and 3.3 of these rules, and the 2nd similarity coefficient is more than 10%, and the 1st and 3rd similarity coefficients are 45% and 30%, respectively if not more than , then the work can be submitted for the third plagiarism check after 5 days. If one of the following results is obtained during the second examination, graduation theses can be submitted to the 3rd examination

15 days after the day of the second examination, and the master's thesis can be submitted in the next semester:

- I coefficient of similarity more than 45% and up to 50%;
- II similarity coefficient more than 10% and up to 40%;
- III similarity coefficient more than 30% and up to 50%.

If in the 3rd review of the work, a satisfactory result is not obtained on one of the similarity criteria specified in clauses 3.2 and 3.3. of these rules, then the student is not allowed to defend the work on that subject.

3.6.3. If one of the following results is obtained during the first plagiarism check, coursework, abstracts, free work, laboratory work, projects and other tasks of this type will be assessed as insufficient, graduation theses will be assessed 15 days after the second plagiarism check, and master's theses will be submitted in the next semester according to Article 2.1 of this rule. It is submitted together with the scientific supervisor's opinion in the form determined by paragraph.

3.6.3.1. If the value of the similarity coefficient I is more than 40% and up to 50%;

3.6.3.2. If the value of the II similarity coefficient is more than 30% and up to 40%;

3.6.3.3. When the value of the III similarity coefficient is more than 40% and up to 50%;

A master's thesis whose results of the first plagiarism check are within the criteria specified in this paragraph can be re-checked only once. If during the re-examination of the work, a satisfactory result is not obtained according to one of the criteria specified in clauses 3.2.5 and 3.3 of these Regulations, then the student is not allowed to defend the master's thesis on that subject.

If the results of the first plagiarism check are within the criteria specified in this paragraph, one of the following results is obtained in the second plagiarism check of the graduation work, the third plagiarism check of that work can be conducted in the next semester.

- I coefficient of similarity more than 40% and up to 50%;

- II similarity coefficient more than 15% and up to 40%;

- III similarity coefficient more than 25% and up to 50%.

If, during the third plagiarism check of that graduation paper, a satisfactory result is not obtained on one of the criteria set for graduation papers in clause 3.2 of these regulations, then the student is not allowed to defend the graduation paper on that subject.

3.6.4. A student will not be allowed to defend a graduation thesis or master's thesis on that subject if any of the following results are received during any plagiarism check:

3.6.4.1. If the value of the similarity coefficient I exceeds 50%;

3.6.4.2. If the value of the II similarity coefficient exceeds 40%;

3.6.4.3. III when the value of the similarity coefficient exceeds 50%;

**3.7. According to the results of the plagiarism check on educational materials, the following decisions are made:**

3.7.1. If one of the following results is obtained during the first plagiarism check of educational materials, the author is given 1 (one) month to make the necessary corrections:

3.7.1.1. If the value of the similarity coefficient I is more than 40% and up to 50%;

3.7.1.2. If the value of the similarity coefficient II exceeds the limit specified in clauses 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of these Rules and is up to 30%;

3.7.1.3. When the value of the III similarity coefficient is more than 25% and up to 40%;

3.7.2. After the expiration of the time specified in clause 3.7.1 of these Rules, the educational material can be submitted for repeated plagiarism check in the form specified in clause 2.3 of these rules. During the repeated plagiarism check, the detection of an unsatisfactory result on one of the criteria defined in clause 3.7.1 of these rules is the basis for not considering the publication of the educational material again.

3.7.3. If one of the following results is obtained during any plagiarism check, the teaching materials will not be re-checked for plagiarism and their publication will not be considered again:

- If the I similarity coefficient is more than 50%;
- When the II similarity coefficient is more than 30%;
- III when the similarity coefficient is more than 40%;

### **3.8. The following decisions are made according to the results of the plagiarism check on doctoral theses of philosophy and sciences:**

3.8.1. If one of the following results is obtained during the first plagiarism check of doctoral theses of philosophy and sciences, the author is given 2 (two) months to make the necessary corrections and provide complete references to the sources used.

3.8.1.1. If the value of the similarity coefficient I is more than 40% and up to 50%;

3.8.1.2. If the value of the II similarity coefficient is more than 4% and up to 15%;

3.8.1.3. When the value of the III similarity coefficient is more than 25% and up to 40%;

3.8.1.5. If there are parts similar to the works of other authors (except for law, organization, concept, rule, instruction names and standard expressions in the relevant scientific field) in the introduction, conclusion and proposals part of the work, as well as in the parts where the scientific novelty of the work is expressed.

3.8.2. After the expiration of the time specified in clause 3.8.1 of these rules, the dissertation can be submitted for repeated plagiarism check in the form specified in clause 2.2 of these rules. If during the second plagiarism check of the work, a satisfactory result is not obtained according to one of the criteria defined in clause 3.8.1 of these Rules, then the question of passing the plagiarism check of that work can be considered no sooner than 1 (one) year. If, during the third plagiarism check, a satisfactory result is not obtained according to one of the criteria specified in clause 3.8.1 of these rules, then the checked dissertation is not allowed for preliminary discussion and the author is not allowed to defend the dissertation on that topic.

3.8.3. If one of the following results is obtained during any plagiarism check, the author is not allowed to defend the dissertation on that topic:

3.8.3.1. If the value of the similarity coefficient I exceeds 50%;

3.8.3.2. If the value of the II similarity coefficient exceeds 15%;

3.8.3.3. III when the value of the similarity coefficient exceeds 40%;

### **3.9. According to the results of the plagiarism check on monographs and scientific articles, the following decisions are made:**

3.9.1. If one of the following results is obtained during the first plagiarism check of a monograph or a scientific article, the authors are given 2 months to make the necessary corrections and provide complete references to the used sources.

3.9.1.1. If the value of the similarity coefficient first is more than 40% and up to 50%;

3.9.1.2. If the value of the II similarity coefficient is more than 4% and up to 15%;

3.9.1.3. When the value of the III similarity coefficient is more than 25% and up to 40%;



3.9.1.5. When similar parts to the works of other authors (except for law, organization, concept, rule, instruction names and short standard expressions in the relevant field of science) are found in the introduction, conclusion and proposals, scientific innovations parts of the work.

3.9.2. After the expiration of the time specified in clause 3.9.1 of these rules, the monograph can be submitted for repeated plagiarism check in the form specified in clause 2.3, and the scientific article in clause 2.4 of these rules. If during the second plagiarism check of the work, a satisfactory result is not obtained according to one of the criteria defined in clause 3.9.1 of these rules, then the question of re-plagiarism checking of that work can be considered no sooner than 1 year. If, during the third plagiarism check, a satisfactory result is not obtained according to one of the criteria defined in clause.

3.9.1 of these rules, then the issue of publication of that work is not considered again.

3.9.3. If one of the following results is obtained during any plagiarism check, the issue of publication of the reviewed monograph or scientific article will not be considered again:

3.9.3.1. If the value of the similarity coefficient I exceeds 50%;

3.9.3.2. If the value of the II similarity coefficient exceeds 15%;

3.9.3.3. III when the value of the similarity coefficient exceeds 40%;

#### **IV. Handling disputes about plagiarism check results**

4.1. The plagiarism commission is established by the order of the rector of UNEC to consider controversial issues regarding plagiarism checks of theses, master's theses, doctor of philosophy and science theses, as well as educational materials. The composition of the commission should consist of at least five people. In addition to UNEC's leading employees, specialists who work in external organizations and have experience in this field can be included in the composition of the commission.

4.2. Disputed issues regarding plagiarism checks of free work, abstracts, course work and other works used within the framework of educational subjects are considered in the commissions (not less than 3 people) created by the Scientific Councils of the faculty, center or schools and composed of persons with academic degrees.

4.3. Decisions of commissions are made by voting and on the basis of simple majority. The commissions are based on the provisions defined by these rules and other normative-legal acts in making decisions.

4.3. If the author is dissatisfied with the result of the plagiarism check, he can appeal to the commission with justification for this dissatisfaction. In justifying the objection, the specific provisions of the plagiarism reference that are not considered correct should be mentioned and the specific grounds of the objection should be indicated for each provision. The Commission may refuse to consider applications without such justification.

4.4. The commission may not accept the parts of the author's own works as a case of scientific plagiarism in determining the relevant criteria when specifying the similarity coefficients obtained as a result of the plagiarism check.

4.5. When determining the number of cases of manipulation, Roman numerals used in the text, mathematical expressions, graphs, schemes and tables, special symbols, expressions required to be written in fonts different from the main font of the text (in Latin or other languages) and other necessary cases can be taken into account.

4.6. The Commission may also consider applications for the presence of similar parts of works published in previous cycles, but not posted on internet resources. Decisions on the case considered in this case are made on the basis of the provisions determined by these Rules.

4.7. The commission formalizes its decision on the result of the plagiarism check with a protocol, submits that protocol together with the report generated in the anti-plagiarism system (in pdf format, paper carrier, etc.) to the head of the institution that made the decision to consider the case at the next stage and to the author of the considered case.